

1
2
3
4
5
6 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

7 DISTRICT OF NEVADA

8 * * *

9
10 FRANCISCO VIDAL,

11 Plaintiff,

12 v.

13 ARNOLD, *et al.*,

14 Defendants.

Case No. 2:17-cv-02885-RFB-GWF

ORDER

15
16 Before the Court for consideration is the Report and Recommendation (ECF No. 4) of the
17 Honorable George Foley, Jr., United States Magistrate Judge, entered December 28, 2017.

18 A district court “may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the findings or
19 recommendations made by the magistrate.” 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). A party may file specific
20 written objections to the findings and recommendations of a magistrate judge. 28 U.S.C. §
21 636(b)(1); Local Rule IB 3-2(a). When written objections have been filed, the district court is
22 required to “make a de novo determination of those portions of the report or specified proposed
23 findings or recommendations to which objection is made.” 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); see also Local
24 Rule IB 3-2(b). Where a party fails to object, however, a district court is not required to conduct
25 “any review,” de novo or otherwise, of the report and recommendations of a magistrate judge.
26 Thomas v. Arn, 474 U.S. 140, 149 (1985). Pursuant to Local Rule IB 3-2(a), objections were due
27 by January 11, 2018. No objections have been filed. The Court has reviewed the record in this
28 case and concurs with the Magistrate Judge’s recommendations.

